



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Shakespeares." This may be conclusive, but we should have liked to see the question more fully investigated, especially on the grounds of similarity of language and metre. An argument of this poem is also given; it takes Richard severely to task for his lack of Rede.

I cannot close this notice without again emphasizing the debt that scholars and the public owe to Professor Skeat for this work. From a literary point of view it helps to make better known the second great poet of that age, a man who wrote not for amusement, but because he could not help writing; a man whose soul was filled with a deep sense of the corruption of the times in both religion and government; who, like the prophet Isaiah or John the Baptist, was a voice in the wilderness, uttering a righteous indignation upon all forms of vice and sin. He was not a doctrinal reformer, and so cannot be compared with his greater contemporary, Wyclif, but he was a most earnest moral reformer, denouncing monk, friar, and layman with his withering curse. Still, it is from a philological point of view that the work is most valuable to the student of the English language, and one who has merely read Chaucer as the representative of the language of this period, will have much to learn, and will rise from the perusal of Langland with a deeper and sounder knowledge of the history and formation of English.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

---

The New English. By T. L. KINGTON-OLIPHANT. 2 Vols. London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1886. I. pp. 625. II. pp. 527.

Those who are familiar with Mr. Kington-Oliphant's "Old and Middle English" (1878) have looked with interest for this work, hoping that it would make a real contribution to our knowledge of the formation of English. The work shows extensive reading and great labor. It covers a period of five hundred years (1300-1800), and is divided into six chapters: I, 1300-1362; II, Chaucer's English, 1362-1474; III, Caxton's English, 1474-1586; IV, Shakspeare's English, 1586-1660; V, Dryden's English, 1660-1750; VI, Dr. Johnson's English, 1750-1886, but the last chapter ends with 1810 and Dr. Johnson figures to only a small extent in it. Chapter VII is an appendix of but ten pages containing short extracts from Wickliffe, Pecoock, Lever, Cowley, Gibbon, and William Morris, which might well have been increased and extended. More than half of the second volume is taken up with the index, which must have required much labor and will be very useful, if complete. The plan pursued is the same as that followed in the author's "Old and Middle English," but it lacks the illustrative extracts which form one of the most valuable features of that work. We might well have spared many of the minor works that the author has so laboriously read and culled from—several being very briefly analyzed—for the sake of extracts from the more important ones, that the reader might have the real English of the day before him rather than Mr. Kington-Oliphant's selection of words and phrases. His plan is, after some very brief remarks on the phonetic changes noticed in the particular work, to select what the author regards as *new* words and phrases, in the order of the several parts of speech, and then to give a list of the words from other than native sources, chiefly Romance, but including also Keltic, Dutch, and Scandinavian words. To these are added the proverbs occurring and the old words

that have survived. It will thus be seen that the work is far from being a history of the English language; it is but a huge collection of materials for such history, a sort of *omnium gatherum* that will serve as a quarry for the future historian. It is, therefore, tedious reading, about as interesting as reading a dictionary, but without the scientific interest aroused in reading each article of Dr. Murray's New English Dictionary. Hence it does not come up to our expectations, but perhaps our expectations may have been raised too high, and it would be wrong to hold Mr. Kington-Oliphant responsible for what he did not try to do. Our only regret is that he did not try to make a genuine history of the English language. One who has read so extensively English works covering a period of a thousand years might give us a more systematic treatise than a simple list of words and phrases that strike him as new or "curious"—a word of which the author is very fond—selected from a multitude of works whose only bond of connection is a chronological sequence. Still we are thankful for what we have, and now look to the author, or some one else, to turn it to good account. The value of such a work depends upon the accuracy with which it has been made. Of this I cannot pretend to judge without following the author over the ground traversed, and this has not been possible. After carefully reading the work from beginning to end, I have noticed but few oversights or inconsistencies. An occasional omission from the index has been observed, but this was to be expected where so many words were to be recorded.

Dr. Fitzedward Hall has already replied through *The Nation* to the criticism of him in note to II 188, and shown that the origin of our progressive passive does not turn on the union of *being* with a past participle, for there are many early examples of the absolute construction, but on the union of that combination with the parts of the verb *to be*, thus forming the passive tenses, which idiom is *new*, *pace* the author. (See *The Nation*, Nos. 1143 and 1164, "Is being built.") But there is another combination of *being* which Mr. Kington-Oliphant notes in the index as "Being, followed by active participle, I 246; II 58." Turning to the first reference, we find: "We have seen *being* set before a passive participle; another step is made in p. 491 ['Rolls,' Vol. V, 1435-37], *the Court beyng sitting*"; and for the second reference we find: "Still more curious (!) is a *patent being drawing* (in drawing), p. 177" [Letters in "Court and Times of James I," 1603-15]. Is either *sitting* or *drawing* here the "active participle"? Is it not rather the *verbal noun*, as appears from the author's own explanation of the second passage, with the preposition omitted? Again, in II 160 we find: "One more curious (!) instance of the confusion between the verbal noun and the participle is in III 121 ["Lives of the Norths," 1730]: "He feared *the being made* infamous"; why "confusion," when the combination is manifestly the verbal noun? Also, in I 245, we find: "There is a fresh idiom in p. 498 [*op. cit. supra*], *the trespass done by Richard takyng her*; Richard is not in the genitive, and therefore *takyng* may not perhaps be a verbal noun." But we sometimes find the *possessive s* dropped after proper names, and so it may be here, where *takyng* must be a verbal noun.

The common modern blunder of the ellipsis of the possessive *s* before the verbal noun should not obscure the character of this part of speech, even if our English grammars often make mistakes about it. It is a fruitful

source of error, but if we substitute the possessive pronoun for the noun, all becomes plain enough except to the illiterate, who so frequently put the objective in place of the possessive pronoun with the verbal noun. The idiom needs a thorough historical investigation, but this will not help matters so long as participles, verbal nouns, and gerunds in *-ing* are confused in their modern usage. Further, in I 273, the author says: "We know the disputes that have arisen about the confusion of the infinitive and the verbal noun; in p. 32 [Letters of John Shillingford, 1447-48] the infinitive *mistrusten* is altered by the Mayor into *mystrustyng*." This is simply a confusion of *sound*, not of parts of speech, as in *beholdyng*, so often found for *beholden*, and even *cusyng* for *cousin*, analogous to the modern *captng* for *captain*. Also, in I 274 [same Letters]: "We hear of the *justices of peas now beynge* or (in) *tyme to comynge*; in the last word the confusion between the infinitive and verbal noun reappears." Not at all; here *to* should be joined to *comynge* as the intensive prefix so common in Old English (Anglo-Saxon), and both *beynge* and *to-comynge* are present participles, not verbal nouns (cf. also I 131 *ad init.*). There seems to be some confusion in Mr. Kington-Oliphant's ideas of participles and verbal nouns; but in I 272 he very rightly says: "The *tyme of servyce doyng* preserves a very old English idiom, for here the accusative is placed before the verbal noun."

But I cannot dwell longer on this subject. It would be interesting to trace the origin of many of our idioms, for which this work supplies materials. Other expressions occurring in these Letters, as *money of youris*, *they and alle theyris*, *my lord of Excetre is* [not *his*] *tenantis*, *Kyng Harey is tyme the Thirdd*, open up wide and interesting inquiries; these may, however, be started on almost every page of the work, but they need careful, thorough, and systematic development.

Mr. Kington-Oliphant is, as may be seen from his former works, a great stickler for a pure Teutonic vocabulary, and never tires of anathematizing Johnson and Gibbon, but even Homer sometimes nods. In II 175 we find: "Johnson was in his lifetime revered by a tasteless generation as the greatest of all masters of English; his disciples, more especially Gibbon, have still further Latinized our tongue"; but on p. 213 we read: "Gibbon was equally careful [i. e. with Macaulay], admirable French scholar as he was, to write English alone in his text; he will have nothing to say to the scores of French words that had been hovering round our doors, in the vain hope of naturalization, for a hundred years before his time." For the sake of consistency this should have read "a Latinized English," for on p. 233 we find again: "We live in better times; we see clearly enough the misdeeds of Hume and Wyatt; ought not our eyes to be equally open to the sins of Johnson and Gibbon? For these last writers the store that had served their betters was not enough; disliking the words in vogue at the beginning of their century, they gave us a most unbecoming proportion of tawdry Latinisms, which are to this day the joy of penny-a-liners."

I must concur with Mr. Kington-Oliphant in his preference for Macaulay as a model in vocabulary to Johnson and Gibbon, but there is danger, in the exaltation of a pure Teutonic vocabulary, of going too far. Whatever is good current English, whether Teutonic or Romance, is open to use by every writer.

The well known estimate of the late Hon. Geo. P. Marsh that English prose, as represented by Macaulay, Webster, and Channing, contains about seventy-five per cent of Anglo-Saxon words, and English poetry, as represented by Tennyson and Longfellow, contains from eighty-seven to eighty-nine per cent, may well be taken as the proportion current in modern standard English prose and poetry. We need not follow Mr. Freeman and strike out every Romance word if we can possibly find an Anglo-Saxon word that may supply its place. The wealth of the English vocabulary should not be so restricted; but Mr. Kington-Oliphant's protest against the penny-a-liners is not superfluous and should not go unheeded.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

---

Bartsch's *La Langue et la Littérature Françaises depuis le IXème Siècle jusqu'au XIVème Siècle. Textes et Glossaire* par KARL BARTSCH, précédés d'une *Grammaire de l'Ancien Français* par ADOLF HORNING. Paris, Maisonneuve et Ch. Leclerc, éditeurs. 1887.

Just twenty-one years ago, in July, 1866, at Rostock, Karl Bartsch put forth the first edition of his now well known work, or rather series of works, on Old French. Deriving his inspiration from Diez, who had derived his from Goethe, Bartsch perpetuated an admirable tradition, and carried into new places, along deeper lines, the currents started high up toward the beginning of the century. This "*Chrestomathie de l'Ancien Français*" (1866) was the first scientific collection of its kind; it was hesitatingly put forth, and its preface breathed the timid hope that it might emerge from the purely "academic circle" and contribute to the stimulation of study in the domain of the Romance languages. That this hope has been richly fulfilled may be gathered from the volume before us, which presents the example of a work that has attained its literary majority, and that has grown and perfected itself with increasing years. All readers of Dryden, of Wordsworth, of the German school of pedant-philologues, know how interesting it is to compare prefaces—to flash mirrors upon the face of a man—and deduce thence the genesis of an intellectual undertaking, the autobiography of an idea, the elaboration of a plan. In his preface are all the *confessions intimes* of the scholar, his trembling ambitions, his flickering hopes, his *pupa* state before he has emerged into the audacious day of untrembling scholarship. Bartsch, studied in this way, reveals a singularly interesting self-glimpse. In the three prefaces through which one is admitted to his modest intimacy, one sees the gelatinous psychological condition in which a first edition naturally discloses the true but timid savant hardening into bolder form, assuming a firmer outline, gathering the definition and clearness of a concentrated intention wrought on and out with delicate care, till, in the one and twenty years of its elaboration, the inspiration assumes its final shape and shows its cherisher in the light of one who no longer trembles.

The astounding fertility of Old French literature made it very difficult for Bartsch in his first volume to present a complete *tableau* of the period 842-1400, more particularly as then few Old French texts had been critically edited. His wise plan was to represent as fully as possible in the original spelling, with dialect *nuances* and variant reading, the diverse tendencies and varied